

1 PUBLIC MEETING SESSION
2 U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
3 DRAFT LOWER SNAKE RIVER JUVENILE SALMON MIGRATION
4 FEASIBILITY REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
5 WITH
6 FEDERAL CAUCUS CONSERVATION OF COLUMBIA BASIN FISH
7 "ALL-H PAPER"
8
9 SEATTLE, WASHINGTON
10 SEATTLE CENTER
11 200 THOMAS STREET
12 SEATTLE CENTER PAVILLION
13
14 PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION
15 FEBRUARY 29, 2000
16 6:30 P.M.
17
18
19 REPORTER: ELSE M. JOSUND MEEK
20
21 RIDER & ASSOCIATES
22 COURT REPORTERS
23 P.O. BOX 245
24 VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON 98666
25 (360) 693-4111

1 MODERATOR: We're going to begin, we have two elected
2 officials signed up and we'll start there. And then
3 we'll move on to the oral comments.

4 With that let's kick off here. We will begin
5 with Heidi Wills followed by Don Cox.

6 >>: Thank you. My name is Heidi Wills. I'm
7 a member of the Seattle City Council. And I'm speaking
8 to you solely as a member of the Council, as the
9 Council as a whole has not taken a position on this
10 issue. I know two of my colleagues have already
11 testified.

12 We're here, the three of us actually, in
13 favor of removing the dams. The reason for that, as
14 you were so eloquent in describing, it has to do with
15 extinction of the species. We knew that in 1980 we
16 were losing one species on the planet every two days.
17 We're now losing 75 species every day. Here we have an
18 opportunity in our state to do something to save a
19 species of salmon which is an icon of the Northwest.
20 In the city of Seattle we have hydroelectric power that
21 we generate in the Skagit River; 25 percent of
22 Seattle's electricity comes from three hydroelectric
23 dams.

24 We do not have a problem with the salmon on
25 the Skagit river. We have among the highest Pink and

1 Chum in the lower 48 states. We have a very healthy
2 return of Chinook as well. But on the Snake River we
3 do not have the Chinook coming whack to spawn, which is
4 deeply troubling. Studies tell us that the next
5 species will go extinct in 2017 and last year none
6 returned to spawn. So the fact that we have an
7 opportunity, we know there's no certainty, but the fact
8 that we have an opportunity and that NMFS has told us a
9 30 percent greater chance of recovery if we remove the
10 dams gives us a high propensity. I hope that we'll
11 take the removal of the dams into consideration. I'm
12 asking you to do everything, the utmost, that we can do
13 to save Chinook salmon for our state. Not just for
14 people's livelihoods who depend on it now, but also for
15 future generations who do not have an opportunity to
16 give public testimony in favor of keeping this very
17 important species of salmon in the Snake River.

18 THE MODERATOR: Don Cox, Maria Tilson, Dan
19 Coler.

20 >>: Thank you for this opportunity. My name
21 is Don Cox. I'm State Representative from the 9th
22 District which includes the area south of Spokane and
23 includes the city of Clarkston and west to Othello.

24 Two of the dams along the Snake River are in
25 our district, and I want to speak very much in

1 opposition of breaching those dams. Our concern is an
2 extinction of the way of life, and we think the
3 breaching of the dams is very much a threat to that way
4 of life for multiple peoples that reside in that area.

5 I appreciate the figures that you gave us on
6 cost. I think you've done your work on that. But I
7 would just reveal my opposition to it occurs because of
8 the impact on the farming industry in Eastern and the
9 heavy impact of the breaching of the dams on that
10 index. The cost of shipping is conservatively
11 estimated to go up to 35 cents a bushel over what it is
12 now if those dams are breached for our area farmers.
13 This industry cannot take that additional hit. It's a
14 struggling industry right now with the global economy,
15 and these people need all of the breaks they can get to
16 survive.

17 The impact on transportation is severe, as
18 you know. The roads and the railway lines that are
19 there now were there to -- they were not about to
20 handle the additional volume of either rail or truck
21 traffic to move that volume of grain, even with the
22 additional price. And the impact of irrigation as you
23 move down, particularly to the lower part of that
24 system, is great.

25 The worst impact however is on the people.

1 The sociopolitical look at what happens to a people who
2 settled that area because their governments and the
3 European states tended to interfere with their land use
4 and water rights and were prejudiced against them
5 because of it. They came here for that reason. They
6 are people who pay their bills. They have earned a
7 reputation of working very hard. They loyally
8 supported our economy in two world wars. And we don't
9 want to alienate that generation of people. What I
10 want to leave with you is that over the greater good.
11 Thank you. I'll move quickly.

12 THE MODERATOR: Thank you very much. Maria
13 Tursi, Daniel Kohter, followed by Steve Munson.

14 >>: My name is Maria Tursi. I'm affiliated
15 with Washpurg. I support the removal of the dams
16 because with them we may find an entire species
17 extinct. I think if we have the chance to save one
18 species we owe it to not only to nature but to
19 ourselves and to our children.

20 THE MODERATOR: Daniel Kohler followed by
21 Steve Munson followed by Sunny Yim.

22 >>: Yes, I also support breachment of the
23 dams. First off, I was just at a seminar important to
24 communities throughout the Northwest, and seeing salmon
25 continue to exist for our kids is very important.

1 Second reason, salmon mean jobs to the
2 Northwest. Recreational fishing into the future with
3 the dams removed has a potential to increase the kind
4 of jobs available for recreation. Estimated at
5 removing the dams would increase recreational jobs by
6 123 million dollars, which means 91 million dollars
7 more than with the dams in place.

8 Also, we can certainly keep our low cost
9 electricity with dam removal as well. You know, right
10 now as it stands throughout this area, we pay less than
11 half the national average. Even with removing the dams
12 we'll be able to pay at a cost less than the national
13 average.

14 And these dams, they don't make sense.
15 Studies are showing that salmon are the next species to
16 go extinct by 2008 and next in 2017. It's important
17 that that does not happen. Removing the four dams is a
18 thing that will make that trend reverse. For those
19 reasons, for economy and jobs in the future, returning
20 salmon, it makes sense to remove the four dams in the
21 Snake River.

22 THE MODERATOR: Steve Munson, followed by
23 Sunny Yim, followed by Mark Lawler.

24 >>: Good evening. My name is Steve Munson.
25 I'm the CEO of Wallcon Power Company. 1,000 megawatts

1 of power. Rated at 737 megawatts. That's enough power
2 for thousands of people. Many people ask where the
3 power comes from to replace the dams. We can provide
4 it. I'm also the head of a program -- I'm the citizen
5 head of a program called the Native Range Alliance.
6 Working with Oregon State to develop native range
7 programs to develop the techniques and the knowledge to
8 bring back rangelands to native lands. We don't know
9 much about the technology yet as a society, but I
10 believe that, and other scientists believe, we can
11 bring back the productivity of the rangelands which
12 provide about 95 percent of the watershed.

13 I quantify the benefits of and the costs of
14 removing the dams. I've also attempted to match the
15 highest benefits with the greatest cost and the
16 greatest costs also with the lowest benefits. I found
17 that in every case the benefits matched and recommended
18 taking down the dams.

19 I've analyzed replacing the electric power
20 with geothermal, conservation with geothermal on a
21 50/50 basis, and gas fire. The net benefits are over
22 40 billion dollars over 36 years.

23 One thing I found that has not been done by
24 the Corps is looking at the benefits to the economy of
25 construction jobs during the dam removal. We find that

1 most of the benefits are under-quantified and the costs
2 are over-quantified. I have gone through this in
3 detail and I'd like to go through it with the Corps on
4 a face-to-face basis if possible tonight.

5 THE MODERATOR: If you wanted to give us your
6 report that you've got there in writing, we'd be happy
7 to take that. Sunny Yim, Mark Lawler, Martha Jackson.

8 >>: I'm Sunny Yim, a student at the
9 University of Washington from Washpurg and I think the
10 best way to save the salmon is to save the stupid
11 dams. I hope to have kids and I want them to enjoy the
12 salmon too.

13 >>: Mark Lawler?

14 >>: I'm actually Captain William Clark, if
15 you would like to change the record. Former Governor
16 of Missouri territory, and with the esteemed Captain
17 Merriwether Lewis.

18 (INSERT SCRIPT DELIVERED TO PANEL).

19 I would like at this moment in time to ask
20 everyone in the audience who believe that we should
21 remove those four dams, stand up now. (Majority
22 standing).

23 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Mark. Martha
24 Jackson.

25 >>: Martha Jackson. Thank you for the chance

1 to speak here.

2 My family has lived in the Pacific Northwest
3 and in the Southwest for almost a century and a half.
4 Science is the best means we have for understanding and
5 predicting what happens in the environment. I respect
6 the scientific research that tells us that breaching
7 the lower four Snake dams is our best chance of salmon
8 recovery. It may be only the start, but let's start
9 there.

10 They tell us that at least sometime in our
11 life there is another person who's very special to us.
12 It feels like the life of that person is almost as
13 important as our life, because their soul is a part of
14 our own soul. When that person falls seriously ill,
15 the most important thing to us is not the cost of
16 healing. What is important is that they heal. We
17 don't argue or equivocate about paying the cost to heal
18 a loved one. They say if I can pay, I will. Whatever
19 the cost is I will find a way to pay. If the best
20 doctors say this medicine must be taken right away, we
21 don't say let's study it for a few more years, we say
22 give us the medicine. If the best doctors say this
23 person must have surgery immediately or else they will
24 die, we don't keep on saying let's get another opinion,
25 we say do it. The salmon are a part of our own soul.

1 We must do what is necessary to help the salmon. That
2 means healing the river. There will be costs to
3 farming, navigation, and manufacturing and this must be
4 mitigated with compassion for those people affected.

5 But we must act now and we must pay the
6 cost. Because we cannot afford not to. Breach the
7 dams now and let the river flow and the salmon live.
8 People are flexible and can survive the loss of a way
9 of life. They can find a new way of life. Salmon and
10 other fish cannot.

11 THE MODERATOR: Erik Ryberg.

12 >>: Hello. I can think of few things more
13 important than saving this fish. As one of some 200
14 million tax-paying Americans I want to say I'm willing
15 to do my share. I'm mostly struck by the affect there
16 will be if we had the will and creative courage so we
17 can help the human communities who will be affected in
18 a hard way. On the other hand, if we do not
19 immediately take steps to help this fish we'll lose
20 immeasurable value to our people and our descendents.
21 If we cannot let a fish as tough as the Chinook salmon
22 survive, then we're not much.

23 Though important to some, barge traffic,
24 commercial fishing, and hydropower is a very poor
25 message for this fish. The fact that your agencies

1 have taken this long to get this far terrifies me. As
2 somebody who wants to be proud of my civilization, I
3 implore you to breach these dams now.

4 THE MODERATOR: Amy Henderson, followed by
5 Theresa Howell, followed by Anita Shelton. Amy
6 Henderson? Theresa Theresa Howell? Followed by --
7 Theresa?

8 >>: My name is Theresa Howell and I am
9 extremely delighted to have testimony here on the 29th
10 day of the year 2000. I think that only happens about
11 every 4,000 years so I'm really excited to be here.

12 One of the reasons that I'm here today is
13 because my grandfather helped build two of the dams on
14 the lower Snake River. He helped to build the lower
15 Monumental as well as the Little Goose. As they were
16 completed in 1975, the salmon population have
17 plummeted. As a kid I can remember going boating right
18 along the stretch of the river we're talking about. I
19 have fond memories of the whole entire stretch of
20 river, really past Lewiston, Idaho, into Idaho, as well
21 as in the southeast corner of the state. And my family
22 income definitely depended on that region. My entire
23 life, and really our well-being from my grandparents to
24 my parents depended on that region.

25 And I also come today as a biologist and an

1 ecologist. I have a minor in biology, chemistry, and
2 ecological studies degree. As it goes I obviously
3 support maximum protection for our salmon. They're
4 imperative to our region. Not only economically, but
5 just for the mere sake of having our salmon. You can't
6 really put a value on the intrinsic value of having a
7 child born today to be able to know what the salmon are
8 like 25 to 50 years from now.

9 And as a native of Washington, I want you to
10 know that we need salmon, and these dams make no
11 sense. We can save our salmon as well as our economy,
12 especially those people in Eastern. I know from
13 experience that we can manage to increase the rail and
14 the trucking and rely less on barges and get those
15 farmers in Eastern who need to ship out to the coast,
16 they'll be able to do that. We managed to do it before
17 1975 and we're going to be able to do it after the year
18 2000. These dams haven't been in all that long and
19 within my lifetime we've come to understand that these
20 dams are the sole reasons that our Snake River salmon
21 are drastically in need of our help. Not only on the
22 Snake River, but I want to make sure maximum protection
23 is in place across the board.

24 THE MODERATOR: Anita Shelton followed by
25 James Galasyn, Dave Battis.

1 >>: My name is Anita Shelton. I want to
2 thank everyone who has taken the time to be here to
3 deal with this critical issue.

4 I'm one of the infamous Californian's who
5 came here. One of the most powerful experiences I had
6 was going for hikes in the woods in the fall of 1976.
7 Any stream you went to, anywhere in the Pacific
8 Northwest, was just swollen with salmon. It was the
9 most incredible thing, and it makes me sad that just in
10 a quarter of a century these same species are
11 threatened with extinction. So I'm here to speak in
12 favor of dam removal. I know you've had a lot of
13 testimony so I'll keep my comments short.

14 But scientists have proven that these fish
15 are capable of making the migration. When they're
16 wild. Hatchery fish don't work. They can't learn to
17 make that arduous migration. We're seeing right now
18 how critically important the salmon are in British
19 Columbia to the ecosystem there. There are a large
20 numbers of bears starving to death. They've had to be
21 hunted and shot, grizzly and black bears, because of
22 the low salmon returns. We know that salmon are an
23 indicator species. When their numbers are threatened,
24 it threatens other numbers. It's easy to forget in
25 this technological world that we're part of the life --

1 we're part of the food chain. As a Seattleite I want
2 to be part of the community that provides leadership in
3 the world. In a place where we have a burgeoning
4 population as well as maintaining our natural
5 resources. We're natural beings. We cannot live
6 without the resources of the earth. There is no amount
7 of money that can buy a species. As the population of
8 the world approaches six billion, it's foolish to
9 consider the extinction of an abundant food source. We
10 need salmon. So these dams don't make sense.

11 THE MODERATOR: James Galasyn? I want to let
12 you know that the tape recordings in the other room,
13 the booths are open for business. I understand there's
14 no line, so if you want to testify at the tape recorder
15 you're welcome to do that.

16 >>: I'm Jim Galasyn, sophomore engineer here
17 in Seattle. I've watched as more and more studies show
18 the profound negative impact of development on the
19 natural world. The relatively plentiful conditions we
20 enjoy on earth, the plants and animals on land, all
21 wild species of the world participate in controlling
22 the global climate.

23 A recent study in the Journal of Nature by
24 zoology professor Shakeem Nueem (phonetic) shows that
25 half of the species may be extinct by 2050. The

1 effects on global climate can only be devastating.
2 Dr. Thomas Carl reports that the rate of global warming
3 is accelerating and reached 4 degrees per century.
4 Finally, the University of Colorado on behalf of water
5 council has recently reported that the supply of clean
6 fresh water for use by humans is shrinking every year.
7 Within 25 years almost half the world's population will
8 be living in water-stressed regions with affects on
9 water-critical species.

10 This is the place to reverse the trend. For
11 the wealthiest nation on earth, the cost of saving wild
12 salmon are negligible. Please breach the Snake River
13 dams. Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Dave Battis, Ted Koch, Chuck
15 Eberdt.

16 >>: I'm from Eastern Washington, in Chelan
17 County. Involved in agriculture. I would urge you to
18 go slow on what's going on. Even though it sounds like
19 we are in an emergency situation. I think these dams
20 have been there for a long time. The fish have been
21 there a long time. We know really very little about
22 what their life cycle is. We're just starting to
23 learn. I think we can bridge the gap right now with
24 hatchery fish. We need to consider the economic impact
25 which in Eastern is severe. The salmon recovery is a

1 long term problem. If we breach the dams it's a
2 short-term problem. It definitely will affect the
3 state's income. We have to have a balanced approach to
4 it. We have to consider true science, not just the
5 political feel good. We didn't get here overnight and
6 we can't recover overnight. Like the Colonel said,
7 after all the media attention is over we have to live
8 with the results. The meetings should be in Eastern,
9 not just over here where we get a biased opinion.

10 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Ted Koch?
11 Followed by Chuck Eberdt, Bradley Stracener. Ted Koch?
12 Chuck Eberdt?

13 >>: I'm Chuck Bert. Board member of a World
14 Institute for Sustainable Humanity. It's a 501 C 3
15 which promotes policies and practices to create or
16 support sustainable healthy environments and life
17 styles for all people. I'd like to thank you for the
18 opportunity to speak tonight, and thank you for making
19 the arduous migration around the region.

20 What occurs to me today listening to the
21 discussion over the last couple of years is that it
22 seems like a lot of folks are looking for somebody else
23 to change, to make the difference. And what I know is
24 that we're all going to have to give on this. Changing
25 no one thing is going to make a difference. We have to

1 address the problem on all the fronts. Harvest,
2 habitat, hydro, everywhere. Having said that it occurs
3 to me that breaching is a single act that can have the
4 greatest impact. I strongly support and encourage
5 breaching for that reason. I recognize it's not
6 without its downside. But good decisions and public
7 policy can and must deal with the negative impacts this
8 would have on the local communities, farmers, and
9 businesses in that area. It's unfortunate that farmers
10 and others in that area must suffer, but the rest of
11 the region and salmon must suffer no more. We changed
12 the system at one point and expected the salmon to
13 adapt to that change. It's time to change the system
14 again and try to adapt ourselves.

15 Finally, we do not have to resort to coal and
16 nuclear power to replace the power these dams produce.
17 So long as we make wise, healthy investments in energy
18 conservation and renewal programs, electricity can be
19 replaced. Salmon cannot. Do not delay long.

20 THE MODERATOR: Bradley Stracener? No.
21 Allison Van, followed by Lisa Andrews and Jim DiPeso.
22 Allison?

23 >>: Hi. I'm a resident of Washington. And a
24 student at the University of Washington. I stand here
25 today because I think the science is in. Removing dams

1 is the best way to protect the salmon. So now it comes
2 down to an issue of values. What's really important to
3 us? As a part-time job I work at an elementary
4 school. It means a lot to me to see the children.
5 They raise salmon in the classroom. I think it makes
6 them feel good to be part of the solution, protecting
7 salmon. Now we need to lead these children and show
8 them how important we as a people and as a society
9 value the salmon. If we cared about the species then
10 we will do what the science tells us is right. We'll
11 do what shows the most likelihood to protect these
12 salmon. We'll remove these dams. Thank you.

13 THE MODERATOR: Thank you, Allison. I'm
14 going to pinch hit for Donna. She's been on her feet
15 now for six hours. Especially since we have another
16 three or three-and-a-half hours to go. So the next
17 speaker is Lisa Andrews.

18 >>: I ask that my testimony be submitted into
19 the report for both Corps' draftings, EIS and the
20 Four-H Paper. I'm here representing the 100,000
21 individuals nationwide who have stepped forward to tell
22 the administration that we need salmon and these dams
23 don't make sense.

24 Tonight people in Washington state are
25 casting their votes in a national primary. But there

1 is another ballot people are casting, and that's the
2 vote for salmon restoration. When we elect our
3 president and senators and representatives we expect
4 they will listen to our concerns. That they will care
5 about our economy. That they will protect our way of
6 life, and that they'll provide a future for our
7 children.

8 Governor Locke, can you hear me? We're
9 voting because we need salmon for our children. Our
10 children deserve a future that includes wild salmon.
11 Some of us have been lucky enough to watch wild salmon
12 spawn in our rivers and streams. It is magical. We
13 believe our children should have the same opportunities
14 and so should you. And we are voting on it.

15 Senator Murray, can you hear me? We're
16 voting because we need salmon for our way of life.
17 Salmon are more than just a symbol for the Northwest.
18 Their spirit is part of who we are and why we live in
19 this region. The Northwest has been described as the
20 place salmon can go. Letting the Snake River salmon go
21 extinct is like cutting out a heart of the Northwest.
22 We won't stand for this any long. We're voting on it.

23 Senator Gorton, can you hear me? Are you
24 there? We're voting. Because we need salmon for our
25 economy. This region was built up around salmon.

1 Salmon provide tens of thousands of jobs and hundreds
2 of thousands of dollars to this region. We can't
3 afford these fish to go extinct. As the Gorton's
4 Fisherman you should know that. We're voting on it.

5 The postcards we're providing today are a
6 small fraction of the hundreds of voters voting to
7 protect the steelhead and salmon and to breach these
8 four dams. It's time for you, our elected officials,
9 to here this message. We call on you Governor Locke,
10 Senators Murray and Gorton to protect our children's
11 future and to remove these four dams.

12 THE MODERATOR: Jim DiPeso. Following Jim is
13 going to Ethan Cantrell and following Ethan is Dolly
14 Dyer.

15 >>: I'm Jim DiPeso, member of the Board of
16 Directors of the Energy Coalition. I speak as an
17 individual.

18 All causes of salmon decline, all four H's,
19 must be addressed. The dams are the primary reason the
20 Snake River salmon are disappearing. It's time to face
21 up. By following the dialogue and breaching the dams
22 we can repair. If we don't breach we'll follow an
23 unbalanced plan. We'll have to put many more fishermen
24 out of business, drain more water out of Idaho, and
25 install severe habitat protection measures. Scientists

1 tell us the fish need something close to a normal river
2 to thrive. More recently we've heard the PATH analysis
3 and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that the breach
4 is the best shot. All science is provisional, but at
5 some point the we must act and return to our values and
6 protect what is left of our national heritage.

7 Defending the dams at all costs may entail
8 high costs indeed. We may lose salmon. We may lose
9 access to hydropower and large indemnity payments to
10 tribes. These treaties are the supreme law of the
11 land. There are those who say there are easier
12 solutions; eliminate the fishing committee. If any of
13 these quick fixes were the answer, our rivers would
14 teem with fish.

15 Finally, we talked about the Four H's and in
16 reality there's a fifth one. Heat. More and more
17 evidence is accumulating that our climate is changing.
18 This is likely to place more stress on Pacific salmon.
19 All the more reason to breach the dams, replace our
20 energy with energy efficient renewables, and do our
21 best to replace habitat and replace hatcheries. Breach
22 the dams. Thank you.

23 THE MODERATOR: Ethan Cantrell. Following is
24 Dolly Dyer and then Kenneth Knapp.

25 >>: Actually, my name is JoAnn Cantrell and

1 this is my grandson, Ethan. He's six weeks old. I
2 brought him out on this cold evening because you all
3 need to hear that restoring the Snake River salmon is
4 an obligation to our grandchildren that we must live up
5 to. I was born and raised in towns like Spokane, Walla
6 Walla, Pullman. Although I now live in Seattle, much
7 of my family lives in farms in small towns along the
8 Snake.

9 When I was born millions of free swimming
10 salmon swam. We would have picnics and enjoy the
11 majesty and beauty of the Snake. You hear that? By
12 the time my youngest son was born they'd gone on their
13 downward spiral toward extinction. My children did not
14 have the opportunities that I had. In one generation
15 we've transformed that mighty river into a series of
16 sledge-water pools that are killing all the salmon. As
17 Ethan grows up I look forward to taking him to show him
18 the majesty that once was the Snake. Will salmon runs
19 be restored in a healthy river for all to enjoy?
20 Ethan and all of our grandchildren are depending on
21 you. We must remove the dams. Thank you.

22 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. And Ethan, thank
23 you for bringing your grandmother here. Next is Dolly
24 Dyeer.

25 >>: It's Polly Dyre. I'm from Seattle. I'm

1 going to say a few things. Thinking back when I was
2 President of Federation of Outdoor Clubs, were we
3 opposed to building the dams we're now trying to
4 remove. I happened to be at my first lobbying job when
5 the senate adjourned. The committee testified in favor
6 of the Wilderness Bill. So I've known about them for a
7 long while. The mistake was made then, but it can be
8 remedied now.

9 I want to mention that you heard earlier
10 today from conservationists. I will not be speaking
11 for the Mountaineers, but I am a chair of the
12 Mountaineers Water Committee. As a member of that I
13 represented the Mountaineers on the Washington State
14 Water Resources forum a few years ago. On that forum,
15 which was a mixture of people from business,
16 recreationalists, and agriculture people. On some
17 things that I found on field trips and studies is that
18 a lot more needs to be done about not only conservation
19 energy, I heard one person mention that, nothing was
20 mentioned that -- while I was present, about conserving
21 water. One of the things that I learned that the
22 farmers do not do but some of them are, one of the
23 members of our forum was putting his irrigation
24 underground rather than having the sprinklers which you
25 see all over the state and the west, evaporating

1 water.

2 The other thing that I thought was
3 interesting and I've heard nothing further about it
4 with the exception of one demonstration, they have
5 technology and instruments where they can measure the
6 amount of water needed by each plant. Say it's a
7 potato plant, but they can determine how much water a
8 particular plant needs, a particular farm needs, rather
9 than just spraying water out because the water is
10 there.

11 So I want to make sure that the people of
12 Eastern have gotten the benefit for the last 40 years
13 from these dams in Idaho and et cetera, but not one of
14 them today while I was listening, not one of the
15 legislators or elected officials said anything about
16 how to conserve energy or water. I think that's some
17 of the things you have to look at.

18 THE MODERATOR: Next is Kenneth Knapp.

19 >>: I'm Ken Knapp. I want to speak for the
20 EIS statement and Four-H papers. I came to the meeting
21 today -- I do not speak for the American Lung
22 Association today, but I live in Spokane and the dams
23 never got me a job. It's just a farce that if we take
24 the dams down everybody's going to be unemployed,
25 losing their jobs, losing everything. It's the same

1 argument whenever we ask the people of Eastern, in the
2 ag business, will they bail their fields and not burn.
3 It's just too important an issue to ignore that we
4 should breach the dams. That's all I want to say. And
5 thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Next J. C. Blankenship.

7 >>: I'm J. C. Blankenship from the east side
8 of the Cascades. Just a concerned citizen. My feeling
9 is that breaching the dams would have an adverse impact
10 on the entire Northwest, including King County. The
11 power system furnishes power throughout the Northwest,
12 including power to all major industries. Impact on
13 already over-taxed highways and other systems would be
14 extreme if the dams were breached. Many forms of
15 recreation as we know them would disappear. Power
16 rates would increase due to an imbalance between supply
17 and demand. And power would go to the highest bidder,
18 not to who has the rights to that power. Hydroelectric
19 power is the cheapest, cleanest power available. It's
20 a reasonable resource. It didn't spring up by
21 accident, but from a continued need for that power. I
22 think the power system was devised by people with that
23 need who a lot of them have more insight than we do.
24 The agricultural system in the state would disappear
25 without the irrigation systems in the Columbia basin.

1 I would give up my right to my share of salmon to have
2 the power, agriculture, and recreation available in
3 great part due to these dams.

4 A couple of other comments. The lady from
5 the City Council commented that Seattle receives 25
6 percent of the power from three hydroelectric dam. I
7 have a clue where the other 75 percent comes from.
8 Also the salmon runs are strong here. The ones going
9 up the Columbia and the Snake have more of a problem.
10 Some other people commented that we can replace the
11 electricity with something else, but right now we don't
12 have anything else. The computer software people,
13 everyone involved that thinks they can run those
14 computers on natural gas, have another thing coming.

15 THE MODERATOR: Next is Patricia Sumption.
16 And then Eric Broman and then Daniel Mensher.
17 Patricia? No. Let's go to Eric.

18 >>: Thank you. I'm Eric Broman. I'm a
19 member of the Sierra Club, although I'm not speaking on
20 behalf of them tonight.

21 I agree with the Colonel's initial remarks
22 that we should take a broader context. One would be to
23 look at history. We could start maybe several million
24 years ago when the salmon first started coming. Maybe
25 if we start 25 years ago when we built the dams. But

1 let's look at the chunk of time brought about by Lewis
2 and Clark. 200 years. They brought their corps of
3 discovery here to Washington, the Pacific Northwest.
4 We fondly remember that corps. But in 200 years, how
5 are we going to remember this Corps of Engineers, in
6 this matter, the EPA, BPA. Well, will they remember
7 this Corps as the corps of heroes who fiddled while our
8 salmon went extinct or the corps of recovery?

9 Now I hate to put Laurie on the spot, I know
10 that she doesn't want to be a Corps of fiddlers. So I
11 respectfully ask you to make the right decision here
12 tonight. And that's to breach the Snake River dams.
13 To take the maximum alternative and do the right
14 thing. And in 200 years, your descendants and mine
15 will remember you for making the right decision.

16 Now there are a lot of other decisions that
17 the rest of us need to make. We've talked about energy
18 conservation. I want to highlight one last point and
19 to ask everyone to remember that we're facing a big
20 decision here in about eight months in November. And
21 the choice or the decision that we'll get to make is
22 very simple. It's also one that will save salmon. I
23 think that to save salmon we need to dam Slade Gorton
24 and remember that in November.

25 THE MODERATOR: Daniel Mensher, Tanya Pergola

1 and Ali Hanks. Is Daniel here? If not, then we'll go
2 to Tanya.

3 >>: Thank you. My name is Tanya Pergola.
4 I'm connected to many things, but I'm here today as a
5 human being. Wow, what a metaphor. Breaching dams on
6 the Snake River would show us all that change and hope
7 is truly alive. I speak about breaching dams because
8 many of us are tired of tinkering with land
9 management. It's time for serious action.

10 When I started my doctoral research on the
11 salmon policy in the Pacific Northwest I never dreamed
12 I would see the conversation get to this stage. The
13 amount of excitement in this campaign is amazing. If
14 we succeed in bringing back the wild salmon we will be
15 an example to this world. We sometimes forget that
16 people are watching us, and what we're doing to manage
17 our natural resources. If we can't do it here then
18 what does it mean for the future of forests and
19 fisheries around the globe? Relentless scientific
20 research from all of us who shared the salmon story
21 have brought us to this point. This journey will
22 inspire the most cynical citizen that environmental
23 degradation is very reversible and if we do our part
24 we'll see the results. I always got unanimous
25 agreement from my students. They would sacrifice those

1 lattes for paying higher prices for electricity. I
2 believe that with environmental issues, our clearly
3 linked behaviors in citizens' minds, all that is needed
4 is a spark to show us that change is possible.

5 We've done enough science, we don't need
6 cost/benefit analysis. We need to just act. What are
7 we afraid of? We have enough intelligence money in
8 our community to make sure all of us survive
9 comfortably.

10 I want to express my support for partial
11 removal of the four Snake River dams. Making this a
12 reality would encourage scientists that their research
13 has made up and inspired citizens that their word
14 matters.

15 I end by pointing out how beautiful this
16 episode would be. During the period of dam
17 construction in the 20th century many Americans have
18 been migrating away from homes, learning, and
19 traditions. There are many scientists who say it's
20 time for us to come back home, in many senses, to share
21 with the next generation. It's time to move the
22 blockages. The connection between American society and
23 natural society is so wonderfully illustrated in the
24 salmon story. I urge you to make this next step a
25 reality. For salmon, Pacific Northwest and all

1 Americans.

2 THE MODERATOR: Next is Ali Hanks, followed
3 by Kenneth Beres.

4 >>: I'm Ali Hanks. A student of the
5 University of Washington and here with Washpurg.

6 As a senior in high school I was in a class
7 that studied a lot of current issues, one of which was
8 the salmon in the rivers like here. My initial thought
9 was, what do I care? I live in Montana and I don't
10 like salmon to eat, especially. But then I read a
11 story about the salmon going down to the river and all
12 the trouble they had to go through to get back to the
13 dams. I thought it was stupid that we went through the
14 trouble to decide what the right answer is when we've
15 got the dams. Why not take them out? They've been
16 here a short time and the salmon have been here longer
17 than us.

18 I was also part of the Speech and Debate and
19 we covered renewable energy. So I know that there are
20 plenty of forms of other forms of energy out there and
21 ready for us to use. Some have been mentioned
22 tonight. It doesn't make sense to me that we would
23 ponder so much over the survival of the species when
24 that's not our power. We should do everything that we
25 can to make sure that we don't destroy something we

1 didn't have any power over in the first place.

2 THE MODERATOR: Kenneth Beres.

3 >>: My name is Kenneth Beres. I'm a printer
4 by trade and a member of Graphics Communication Union.
5 I'm speaking as a concerned citizen tonight.

6 Today is election day in the state of
7 Washington. Participation in our democratic process is
8 one of the rights we Americans cherish most. We elect
9 those who represent us at nearly every level of
10 government. We would be more than a little indignant
11 if our right to vote were taken away. Our actions
12 tonight will determine the fate of Snake River salmon.
13 They're as much a part of America as everybody in this
14 room. They don't get to vote. So please make sure to
15 keep their best interests in mind. Our ingenuity will
16 address the challenges of removing these dams. We know
17 how to replace the benefits. We don't know how to
18 replace the salmon once they go extinct. We can live
19 without the dams. The salmon can only live without
20 them. We need the salmon, and those dams don't make
21 sense.

22 THE MODERATOR: Claire Gilchrist followed by
23 Jessica Long followed by Thea Levkovitz.

24 >>: My name is Claire Gilchrist and I ask
25 that my testimony be submitted for the Corps' and

1 Federal Caucuses Four-H paper. I'm here to voice my
2 support for alternate four and three in the Four-H
3 paper, both of which require removal of the dams
4 because those dams don't make sense.

5 Why this administration and elected officials
6 are unable to see that is beyond me. Our salmon and
7 steelhead populations are already extinct or on the
8 brink. No other option has returned or will return
9 enough fish to recover these species. Senator Gorton
10 has insisted that we don't need to remove these dams to
11 restore runs. But what is the other plan? As Governor
12 Kitzhaber has said, if not the dams then what? It
13 takes courage to find the solution and work to
14 implement it. Do none of our other leaders have this
15 courage? Senator Gorton's families became rich from
16 fish sticks and battered fillets. Already this region
17 has lost tens of thousands of jobs due to drastic
18 declines. Yet Senator Gorton continues to ignore the
19 very community that made him wealthy. Now he's
20 breaking their backs for his political gain. He knows
21 fish sticks, he doesn't know what salmon need to
22 survive. They need cold, clean, fast rivers. What the
23 salmon need is what we need too. Salmon is an
24 indicator of our ecosystem and if they disappear we
25 do.

1 But unfortunately the Senator is not alone.
2 Now it seems that the Senator has a minion in Governor
3 Locke. He's selling our community down the river --
4 actually up the river. We as Washingtonians deserve
5 more from our elected officials. We deserve officials
6 that are courageous, and we deserve a future that
7 includes rivers alive with salmon. We must get rid of
8 these four federal dams for our children, way of life,
9 and our economy. Thank you.

10 THE MODERATOR: Next Jessica Long and Thea
11 Levkovitz.

12 >>: My name is Jessica Long. I'm a student
13 at the University of Washington here with Washpurg.
14 Extinction is forever. Dams are not. The next species
15 of salmon is slated to go extinct eight years from
16 now. We need action now. We need to remove these
17 dams. Thank you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Thea Levkovitz next. And
19 then Sean Rogers and Jim Dawson.

20 >>: Good evening and thank you for being here
21 and listening to all of us. My name is Thea Levkovitz,
22 Vice President of the Washington Wildlife
23 Preservation. An organization who works for the
24 protection of wildlife in their habitat. Submitted on
25 for the record for the Corps' draft EIS and the Four-H

1 paper.

2 The Snake River is a unique and important
3 ecosystem that's in danger of losing wild salmon and
4 steelhead. I would urge you here today to take this
5 opportunity to protect the ecosystem. To take the
6 steps that include the removal of these dams. It makes
7 no sense for our economy. Your own analysis shows that
8 it would be better off removed. Keeping the dams makes
9 no sense to the salmon.

10 Past scientists found the best chance for
11 recovery of Snake River salmon is to remove the dams.
12 Keeping the dams makes no sense for culture or
13 heritage. The Pacific Northwest is known for salmon
14 and yet here we are today debating whether to take an
15 action that would save this regional icon or let these
16 fish go extinct.

17 A true story last night. My nine-year old,
18 Jess, who couldn't be here tonight, is studying the
19 pioneers in third grade. Just last night reading some
20 of his schoolwork describing the pioneer father tilling
21 the fields, and behind him was described the passing of
22 a passenger pigeon. And my son said, what is that? In
23 that moment we both faced a sad reality of our time. I
24 had to tell him that they were gone. They were
25 extinct. He would never see one. Most of us in this

1 room were born after the passenger pidgeon went
2 extinct. I wonder if he'll be asked by his son what is
3 a salmon?

4 When I put my name in the lottery box this
5 morning I wondered what needed to be said? The people
6 tending the box said you wanted to hear what was
7 missing. All the reasons are very compelling. But
8 what is missing in the analysis, it is the moral,
9 ethical, and spiritual criteria. What is the cost to
10 our integrity, fullness of human beings, and our
11 integrity that we allow these salmon to go the way of
12 the passenger pidgeon? I like to know that tonight I
13 can say that we were bold and we made the right choice
14 and removed the dams.

15 >>: Hi. My name is Sean Rogers from
16 Olympia. Thanks for holding this. The thought that
17 keeps going through my head is something that a teacher
18 told me once who talked about replacing short-term pain
19 for long-term pleasure and if we don't do that we end
20 up with short-term pleasure for long-term pain. He was
21 talking about my future, but it's the same thing here.

22 A representative from the 9th District came
23 up and talked about all the economic problems we're
24 going to have. We're going to have economic problems
25 any ways. These are problems to our economy. Our

1 life. The way that we've decided to make this country
2 run. But, these problems aren't unsolvable. I mean,
3 we're Americans. We didn't say, oh, it's too far to go
4 to Oregon. No, we went. And all of this, I've heard
5 it a million times before, you can't do without nuclear
6 power. Well, I'm intelligent I think. Not doing
7 things is bad for the economy. Sustainability. What's
8 my grandchildren going to do for economy? But I would
9 like to see salmon stay around. Salmon are just an
10 indicator species. We have a zillion problems going.
11 Salmon are only one. Looking at the maps back there I
12 saw like 20 or 30 dams along the Snake/Columbia River
13 drainage. I think we can do without these four.

14 So I'd like to recommend that you go along
15 with your 4th proposal, even though it's not going to
16 be easy. This is not your decision. This is
17 Congress's decision. And they can do whatever they
18 want. A lot of these congressman have no idea what
19 life is like in the Northwest. So I'm hoping you
20 really go to bat for the 4th one. This is our future,
21 your grandchildren's future, and mine. Thanks.

22 THE MODERATOR: Next is Jim Dawson and then
23 Ed Henderson and Doug Howell.

24 >>: Hi. I'm Jim Dawson and I'm speaking on
25 behalf of myself today.

1 Not too many people have in their comments,
2 while I agree with all the comments supporting the
3 removal of the four lower dams, is in your cost/benefit
4 analysis I feel you failed to analyze the benefits.
5 It's a qualitative thing and that's the rejuvenation of
6 the soul that we experience seeing these species return
7 from their long journey from the ocean and the amazing
8 things they overcome.

9 In cost/benefit analysis and economics I
10 understand there's a willingness to pay, so I pose what
11 are you willing to pay for the rejuvenation of your
12 soul and what are the costs you're willing to afford
13 for that?

14 Personally, I moved out here because of the
15 wild places left here. I'm from Michigan. I came here
16 because I can't experience that there and I don't want
17 to see this place turn into the same thing. I feel we
18 have excellent opportunities to prevent that from
19 happening and to maintain the benefits of that
20 rejuvenation of our soul. In your considerations I
21 know these are intangible things that you can't
22 possibly analyze in your cost and scientific analysis,
23 but keeping in mind of the -- I would say 200 people
24 here who seem to be sharing the same concerns. So I
25 appreciate the work that you're doing and the difficult

1 situation you're in to analyze this. So thank you for
2 taking the time.

3 THE MODERATOR: Next Ed Henderson followed by
4 Doug Howard and then James Chapman.

5 >>: I'd like my remarks to go on both the
6 points, please. Good evening. My name is Ed Henderson
7 name.

8 My wife and I live in the Pacific Northwest
9 because of the quality of life here. Wild salmon are
10 an integral part of the fabric of life here. I'm a
11 registered professional civil engineer. I've practiced
12 for over 30 years. When I attended college, the halls
13 of my engineering school were lined with pictures of
14 great achievements of civil engineering. In my career
15 I pride myself in finding clever solutions, in
16 overcoming obstacles. More than that, I take
17 satisfaction in the contributions engineers make to
18 society improving the quality of life for everyone.

19 We lost that vision on the lower Snake
20 River. In constructing the four lower Snake River dams
21 we were carried away by our pride, and lost sight of
22 our duty to improve the quality of life for everyone.
23 Disregarding the consequences because we could build
24 those dams, we did. At the time the dams were built it
25 was well known that the costs outweighed the benefits.

1 It is now clear that the ecological and economic
2 benefits of removing them far exceeds the value of
3 leaving them in place. We must turn away from the
4 technology embodied by the four lower Snake River
5 dams. They do not meet the test of benefit to
6 society. Never did. Those dams don't make sense and
7 we need salmon.

8 The Snake River dams provide no flood control
9 and they kill salmon. They provide irrigation to only
10 thirteen farms and they kill salmon. They provide only
11 five percent of the Northwest's electrical power and
12 they kill salmon. Yes, there are other alternatives to
13 recovering wild salmon, but they are far less
14 successful and they cost much more. Removing the dams
15 is the most economic benefit to restoring the salmon.
16 It is technologically feasible and the impacts of
17 removal can be mitigated. All that is lacking is
18 political courage. To delay is to invite extinction.
19 As Governor Kitzhaber of Oregon questions, exactly what
20 scientific experiment additionally is necessary to
21 demonstrate that it is easier for salmon to negotiate a
22 river than to negotiate a 500 foot high barrier? They
23 don't make sense and we need salmon.

24 THE MODERATOR: Doug Howard. James Chapman
25 and Roy Goodman.

1 >>: You get a three for one tonight. This is
2 why we're here. And this is why we live here in the
3 Northwest and this is why we were raising our family
4 here. The quality of life. And the salmon is our
5 Northwest version of the canary in the coal mine. I
6 want the decision that you make to think about 50
7 years, 60 years, and maybe he'll live to the next
8 century and think about it for the next hundred years.
9 Everything seems to point to dam removal. That should
10 be the find word. So we're going to keep it short
11 because he'll hit the dam like the salmon. So we'll
12 take off. And I just want to say, this is why we're
13 here. Thank you.

14 THE MODERATOR: Next is James Chapman.

15 >>: My name is James Chapman. I would like
16 to have my remarks in both reports. I grew up on a
17 farm in the valley of northeast Oregon. Those waters
18 fall in the Snake River just downstream from where
19 Oregon, Washington, and Idaho come together. I
20 remember a lot of the experiences I had with salmon as
21 I was growing up. I still own that farm, and I belong
22 to the ditch company that takes irrigation out. And I
23 go back to that farm many times during the year. I use
24 that time to explore the back roads. And I have
25 personally driven across three of the four dams at

1 least twice. Only the Lower Granite Dam is the only
2 one I've missed, but I have seen its back waters.
3 Those travels have allowed me to develop some thoughts
4 about dam removal and our attitudes about salmon.
5 First of all we really seem to blame the other guy.
6 Whether dams, farms, logging, roads, development,
7 seals, orcas, tribes, Canadians, Alaskans, Japanese, El
8 Nino or La Nina. But the truth is we're part of the
9 problem and part of the solution. We need to work
10 together.

11 The second thing is that a lot of people
12 talking about dams being off the table seem to me
13 they're really saying if it comes down to it, if the
14 dam is proved beyond a doubt to be necessary to be
15 taken out to be breached to save the salmon, then are
16 we going to have the guts to sacrifice some of our way
17 of life in order to save them? Or are we going to say
18 salmon be damned, let them go extinct? I say no. They
19 are part of our heritage. To lose the salmon we're
20 losing part of ourselves.

21 Real quickly, on the dams themselves it's
22 always been all or not. Take them out or keep them all
23 in. Why don't we look at the possibility of taking the
24 two middle ones out? The Lower Monumental, and the
25 Little Goose. They're remote and tucked away. The

1 impacts are going to be only in part. Let's see what
2 happens there. Then you can look at the Lower Granite
3 which has the benefits of the waterfront. But that
4 could be looked at later and keep the Ice Harbor which
5 has all the irrigation. Thank you.

6 THE MODERATOR: Next speaker Roy Goodman.

7 PANEL MEMBER: The last two gentleman that
8 spoke, you said you were making comments for both
9 documents. I assume you -- please keep in mind there
10 are three documents. So I want you to specify which
11 the reports you're referring to for the benefit of the
12 reporter and the record.

13 THE MODERATOR: Roy Goodman.

14 >>: Good evening. My name is Roy Goodman.
15 Today I'm a song writer. I scripted a song for this
16 evening's occasion. I believe it will be a familiar
17 melody to many here. And since the last line of each
18 verse repeats itself, I invite you to join me in
19 repeating the last line of each verse.

20 (SINGING TO TUNE OF GILLIGAN'S ISLAND).

21 Sit right back and you'll hear a tale about
22 Snake River salmon runs which flourished til four dams
23 were built by narrow-minded pork barrel political scum
24 (repeat).

25 Those dams give little hydropower for all

1 their earthen mass, and if you think they'll save you
2 from a flood -- your head is up your rear -- your head
3 is up your rear. I couldn't find a good rhyme there.

4 For Snake River salmon to return those four
5 dams must be tossed. If this simple scientific and
6 economically sound logic isn't followed the salmon will
7 be lost -- the salmon will be lost. Forever they'll be
8 lost.

9 So you federal folks get your act together,
10 for the people they have spoken. We want the Snake
11 River to flow free. Those dams they must be broken.
12 Those dams they must be broken.

13 Yes, the future of salmon is in your hands;
14 what is their fate to be? Extinction, a daily return,
15 or millions of salmon and their wives, -- I couldn't
16 resist that one -- we want to see wild salmon swimming
17 free here in the great Northwest -- here in the great
18 Northwest. (END SINGING).

19 Thank you.

20 THE MODERATOR: Thank you. Next is Timothy
21 Stearns, Brian Bakken and then Jesse Feathers.

22 >>: Of all the people I could follow. My
23 name is Tim Stearns. I'm the Director of the
24 Northwestern National Resource Center for the National
25 Wildlife Institution. I've worked in active resource

1 management for my entire professional career. Trying
2 generally to fix problems, to protect places, and to
3 change the region thoughtfully as we move forward.

4 During my experience the science has evolved
5 to gain a new respect for natural processes. To use
6 technology to compliment and not destroy. The
7 cumulative impacts are reality. We've now learned that
8 we must live within biological limits. But I'm
9 disappointed and frustrated. It's been ten years since
10 we listed these fish. Twenty five years since this new
11 stage of declination began. We've analyzed this
12 process to death. We've had process after process,
13 study after study, with one same startling conclusion.
14 There are no easy choices. All we've accomplished is
15 prolonged uncertainty. One refrain this set of
16 hearings is that we should try everything else before
17 dam removal. Well, sadly we've tried nearly everything
18 else. We've put all conceivable fixes. We've tried to
19 build more hatcheries. We harvested fish for our
20 culture, food, economy, and families. But now we need
21 to harvest more intelligently.

22 Through this whole process we haven't lacked
23 money. We haven't lacked good engineering or talent.
24 We had the vision to build the system, but so far we
25 have lacked the vision to fix the problem that we

1 created. We clearly have a difficult transition to
2 move further. There will be impacts to dam removal and
3 we shouldn't deny there have been impacts from dams.
4 We need to modernize our energy and transportation
5 systems.

6 But one thing I think we need to be mindful
7 of is that we have two resources. We have natural
8 resources and people resources. We need to balance
9 them as we go forward. Dams are just tools. They
10 shouldn't be something we revolve our world around.
11 Many dams make sense. These don't.

12 Finally, we need healthy farms. Healthy
13 tribal communities. Healthy coastal communities. But
14 they can only work within a biological structure and
15 function that works for fish and for people. Thank
16 you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Next up is Brian Bakken
18 followed by Jesse Feathers and then Pat Ford. Brian
19 not here? Jesse Feathers.

20 >>: Good evening. My name is Jesse
21 Feathers. I grew up in Lewiston, Idaho. I'm here to
22 say that at a minimum the four dams should be
23 breached. I was in Lewiston High School in 1975 when
24 the last of the Snake River dams was completed. I
25 admit I was intrigued by the idea that Lewiston might

1 become something else than just a paper mill town. It
2 was known as the armpit of Idaho and the hope that the
3 dams and slack water would change this. A seaport
4 after all. That conjured up all sorts of images.
5 Ships from far off places, sailors with stories to
6 tell, a cosmopolitan city that one would be proud to go
7 call home. The promises were fewer than the deduction,
8 and the fact of the matter is that Lewiston still is
9 the armpit of Idaho. Twenty five years of being a
10 seaport has produced hardly any growth. While other
11 cities like Couer d'Alene and Boise have bloomed,
12 Lewiston has stagnated. The amount of jobs the seaport
13 has generated is a pittance. People like myself have
14 been forced to move on to Boise or Portland or
15 Seattle. What was gained from the dams? A subsidized
16 water gain from the barges, a pool of water for a
17 handful of farmers, and a lake for water skiers.

18 What was lost? Who can say how many light
19 industries might have moved to Lewiston if they'd
20 cleaned up their paper mill? And who can say how many
21 jobs would have been introduced if the river had
22 remained free flowing and recreation was included?

23 Most people in Seattle don't know where these
24 lands are or what they are. They don't know that
25 Hell's Canyon is deeper than Grand Canyon. How many

1 jobs were lost because the Chamber of Commerce didn't
2 promote this as a national park? We've wiped out
3 thousands of jobs for commercial fishermen. We've
4 reduced treaty rights to meaningless pieces of paper.

5 So, I say for starters, let us remove the
6 four Snake River dams and then let us have the vision
7 to do more. Let us build a better highway and railroad
8 between Lewiston and Tri-Cities. Let's clean up or
9 mitigate the other things. And for the sake of our
10 hometown, add Hell's Canyon to the park system. It
11 needs a new vision that doesn't include dams.

12 THE MODERATOR: The next speakers will be Pat
13 Ford and then we'll take a ten minute break. And then
14 Jim Baker and Rachelle Turner. So Pat Ford last before
15 the break.

16 >>: Thank you sir. My name is Pat Ford.
17 Executive Director of the Save the Wild Salmon
18 Coalition. For the record, we support broadly
19 alternate four in the Army Corps' EIS and alternate
20 three in the Four-H paper.

21 On behalf of our 54 member organization, I
22 first want to thank the gentleman in the back of the
23 room who has been all day making these nice flying
24 salmon for a lot of us. It's the beauty of salmon and
25 the artistry that they bring forth.

1 In our voices as you've heard, in our hands
2 and in our bodies, is not the least of the reasons why
3 we need salmon.

4 Second I want to thank on behalf of every
5 individual member of all our 54 organizations in the
6 four north states and Alaska, Governor John kit soper
7 of Oregon for his vision and leadership in being the
8 first state-wide elected leader in the Northwest to
9 support partial removal of the four lower Snake River
10 dams. We are determined that he will be joined soon by
11 other elected leaders who we know care about the future
12 and recognize that the reward for leadership come to
13 those who respect the burden of being.

14 Third, I want to thank everyone here tonight
15 who are showing by their testimony and presence that
16 they agree that we need salmon. I include all who have
17 spoken and appeared, whatever their opinions and
18 beliefs. In the end, whether Northwest salmon are
19 returned to health or go extinct in the Columbia basin,
20 all over Puget Sound, will be a democratic decision,
21 small d, made by the people in the Northwest. This is
22 not the administration's decision, Congress's decision,
23 or the many memberships represented here. It's the
24 people's decision. The way people make difficult
25 decisions is that a small number of people start by

1 deciding that they'll take a matter into their own
2 hands and in so doing over time a full group of people
3 eventually come to a decision. And the people at these
4 hearings are the ones taking the matter into their
5 hands, and in so doing leading to the time when people
6 will make the democratic decision.

7 Finally I want to thank John McCain, George
8 W. Bush and Bill Bradley for indicating by their
9 different but very actively-stated positions on this
10 issue that this is one of the most compelling public
11 matters. We look forward to Al Gore in his capacity
12 not as Presidential candidate but as Vice President of
13 the Union by directing or allowing federal agencies in
14 the Northwest to recommend partial removal of the dams.

15 THE MODERATOR: We'll have a ten minute break
16 and then we'll resume.

17 (Break taken).

18 >>: Okay. We have Jim Baker on deck. And
19 then coming up will be Rachele Turner and then I'm not
20 sure -- looks like Tina Kaps.

21 >>: Good evening. For the record I'm Jim
22 Baker, resident of Whatcom County, Washington. I work
23 for the Sierra Club, but speaking on my own behalf.

24 I wanted to talk about two of the documents
25 which have not had the kind of comment from the public

1 which they deserve. First of all biological
2 assessment. Frankly, ladies and gentlemen, it is the
3 height of arrogance on the part of the action agencies
4 to demand actions in the other three H's as you do in
5 the draft biological assessment. The Corps of
6 Engineers, Bonneville Power and Corps of Reclamation
7 should put their own glass houses together. Especially
8 when your glass house is not even fully built in the
9 biological assessment. I'm sorry, a construct doesn't
10 provide the public, much less the fish, with even a
11 minimum of the protections required under the
12 Endangered Species Act.

13 Secondly, we talked about the phase-one study
14 of John Day dam. First of all, fish biologists, not
15 the Corps of Engineers, should analyze the potential
16 benefits of any and every reaction proposed to help
17 these fish. The independent scientific group in 1996
18 identified John Day as one of the single best actions
19 to be taken in order to help all salmon in the Columbia
20 basin. That says to me there is sufficient
21 justification from the biologists to proceed to a
22 second phase study.

23 Now, the Corps' cause make a case in this
24 phase one study against full removal of John Day. But
25 I urge the Corps of Engineers, please proceed with a

1 phase two study of storing crest dry out. For all of
2 these documents, I am concerned at the least of the
3 failure of the agencies to consider the massive costs
4 of extinction. Legal scholars tell us that violating
5 multiple Federal laws and treaties in this way will put
6 the United States on the hook for appellants running to
7 the tens of billions of dollars. It would lead to the
8 worst case of no salmon, no fishing, no cheap power,
9 shipping or water, and, worst of all, no investments to
10 protect these in the 21st century. Those who want to
11 keep all dams no matter what should ponder that ancient
12 curse, you must be careful what you ask for because you
13 may get it. I plead with all of you, especially you,
14 Colonel, to remember that you hold in your hands the
15 beating heart of the Northwest economy and way of
16 life. Please, please don't clench your fists. Thank
17 you.

18 THE MODERATOR: Next is Rachelle Turner and
19 then Tina Caps and Nicole Cordan.

20 >>: My name is Rachelle Turner. I'm a
21 student from the University of Washington and in
22 support of dam removal.

23 I wish I could share a story about salmon but
24 I've never had a chance to see salmon in the Snake
25 River. But I care about salmon and their future. I'm

1 not even here representing myself but hundreds of other
2 students who share my concerns. I would like to share
3 a quote that we did not inherit our earth from our
4 fathers but we've borrowed it from our children.

5 THE MODERATOR: Next Tina Kaps and Nicole
6 Cordan and followed by Michael Rossotto.

7 >>: Hi. My name is Tina Kaps from the
8 University of Washington. I've had a unique
9 opportunity to work with students on campus on this
10 issue. What I find is that most students don't know
11 about it. But the overwhelming question I get is, I
12 don't understand why the dams were? Why is the salmon
13 going extinct? This doesn't make sense.

14 The other most amazing thing is that in my
15 lifetime we're standing on the brink, and the brink is
16 extinction of the species which is a symbol of the
17 Pacific Northwest, or on the brink of making tough
18 choices of taking actions that need to be done. It's
19 time to do the right thing. Please don't let our
20 salmon go extinct.

21 THE MODERATOR: Next Nicole Cerdan.

22 >>: Good evening. My name is Nicole Cerdan.
23 I'm here representing the National Wildlife Federation
24 and our 4 million plus members and supporters submit to
25 both the Corps' draft EIS and the Caucuses' Four-H

1 paper.

2 NWF supports the removal of the four dams.
3 Not because it's a silver bullet, but because it's a
4 way to save these stocks and the salmon don't have time
5 to wait. I prepared testimony tonight with facts and
6 figures of what was missing in a bunch of other policy
7 things. But yesterday I learned that had three friends
8 had new babies in their lives. Three little ones that
9 would grow up here in the Northwest. As a few of us
10 celebrated these new lives, the conversation moved to
11 our own futures and legacies. Funny how kids can do
12 that to you.

13 We asked what we would want to tell our
14 children that we had accomplished in our lives? What
15 we want our legs to be. I said that I hoped that I
16 would be able to tell my children and grandchildren
17 that I had a small part in helping to save the salmon
18 and steelhead in the Northwest. I can't imagine what
19 it would be like to explain that we had an opportunity
20 to save these fish and we chose not to. That we had an
21 opportunity to meet our legal and moral obligations to
22 the peoples of this region and we chose not to. That
23 we had the opportunity to protect the very livelihood
24 and liveability of the Pacific Northwest and we chose
25 not to. It's not a legacy that I want.

1 If there's something that I want to point out
2 tonight about what's missing in these analyses, it's the
3 children, the native people. It's the nature of the
4 Pacific Northwest that's missing.

5 So I ask what do you want your legacy to be?
6 I hope you join me and others in this room in this
7 region and in this nation that believe that we need
8 this and these dams don't make sense. Welcome to this
9 world to Tess and Max and Lisa.

10 THE MODERATOR: Michael Rossotto.

11 >>: Hi. I'm Michael Rossotto. I am the
12 Director for the Legal Program at the Washington
13 Environmental Council. Also a member of the executive
14 board of the Northwest Energy Coalition, although
15 tonight I'm testifying on my own behalf. I support
16 four in the EIS and three in the Four-H paper.

17 When I first moved to the Northwest fifteen
18 years ago I studied the Northwest Public Planning Power
19 Council's fish and wildlife amendments at the time.
20 That was when the Power Council first released
21 assessments that salmon used to return to the Columbian
22 basin. They decided that the fact that only about 250
23 -- two and a half million salmon were returning was a
24 big problem. Those of us who looked closer realized
25 that only about 500,000 of those were wild fish and we

1 knew we had a real problem. The government dragged
2 it's feet on ESA listing. We know fifteen years later
3 that the water budget didn't get the job done.
4 Spilling and barging haven't gotten the job done.

5 It's time to stop tinkering around. We know
6 the science that we need to get the dams out of there
7 and get the fish back. We've seen the studies that
8 show that the economics work out that the regions be
9 kept whole. The first time I saw a wild salmon in the
10 Northwest was a Chinook leaping in the pool below the
11 Elwha dam looking for a way upstream. I'm happy to say
12 that it looks like we're on a course to get those back
13 up the river, and we need to move on to get rid of the
14 Snake River dams. Thank you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Next is Kathryn Mostow.

16 >>: I'm Kathryn Mostow, employed with the
17 County Health Department and a physician.

18 I want to first say that the issue of salmon
19 dams, like its close cousin the ancient forest, is a
20 complex issue for most of us. I don't feel I have the
21 time to sit on the fence any more. It seems clear that
22 the fate of salmon is in grave danger, and we've been
23 given an opportunity to reverse that and give life back
24 to them. As a human race we've asked for so many
25 sacrifices from other creatures. We've altered

1 landscapes with dams, clear cuts, and highways. We've
2 driven a large number of species to threatened status
3 or extinction. In economic terms, if we choose to,
4 breach the dams, which is the option I support.

5 I don't mean to minimize these sacrifices but
6 I think it's important to put them into perspective.
7 We believe that we have a choice before us. Wild
8 salmon or dams. I believe this is artificial because
9 ultimately aren't we really choosing life or death?
10 Barbara Board (phonetic) wrote we can not cheat on
11 DNA. We cannot get around photosynthesis. We can't
12 say I don't give a damn about phytoplankton. All of
13 these give indications of our planetary life. To say
14 that we say we choose death? I choose life. I know a
15 majority of Northwesterners choose life too. Breach the
16 dams and choose life for the salmon. Now the singer in
17 me wants to sing you something.

18 (SINGING).

19 The beauty in you is the beauty in me. Is
20 the beauty in the mountain, is the beauty in the tree.
21 Is the beauty in a squaw hole and a porcupine's
22 quiver. Is the beauty of a wild salmon running in a
23 free-flowing river.

24 Thank you.

25 THE MODERATOR: Brad Kahn.

1 >>: My name is Brad Kahn, and I comment on
2 the EIS and the Four-H Paper. I spent a long time
3 staring at the screen on my computer thinking about
4 something new. The more I thought the more I became
5 convinced we have had enough information. There are
6 these studies, biological assessments, now we're taking
7 part in this survey in the form of official public
8 meetings. All these meetings will be tallied, cross
9 tabulated, and tested for significance. In the end
10 they'll be recorded in a document that I guess will
11 weigh between twenty or thirty pounds before appendices
12 and will people read all this information? I don't
13 think so. I suspect that these reports will fall in
14 the laps of some unlucky aides and assistants who will
15 have to pore over thousands of pages and provide a
16 five-page summary. We have enough information to make a
17 decision. In every decision there's an element of
18 uncertainty. We'll always have questions about our
19 decision. Always have difficulty in foretelling the
20 future. Does this mean we should cease making
21 decisions? Impossible. Simply deciding not to decide
22 is a decision. But all the while Snake River salmon
23 continue to go extinct.

24 So how do we make the best decision if we
25 can't tell the future? We look at past trends. Towns

1 like Pasco, Lewiston, and Kennewick continue to miss
2 the booms. We see decades of fish barging and
3 hatcheries failing to restore self-sustaining salmon
4 hatcheries. And coastal fishing economies -- we see
5 sharply declining salmon runs. Do these dams bring
6 wealth, health, and prosperity to the Northwest?
7 Doesn't seem that way. A close look at the past 25
8 years prove that technological quick fixes to do not
9 circumvent the fact that salmon need free-flowing
10 rivers. If we begin breaching the dam today it may
11 take ten years to bring back a free-flowing river.
12 Simple math tells us that it's time to act now. We've
13 tried other approaches, we've analyzed the science,
14 we've studied its economics. Now it's time to save
15 salmon. Please breach these four dams.

16 MODERATOR: Let me address the issue again.
17 There was at least one gentleman who was here earlier
18 who planned to speak and he was opposed to dam
19 breaching. He got up and left during a clapping
20 session. So it's hard if people don't feel welcome to
21 say something. It might be the clapping -- but there's
22 a Council side. That is the intimidation and concern
23 and lack of welcome that folks who don't agree with you
24 feel. I do want to hear what everybody has to say on
25 both sides. Apologize for holding you up.

1 >>: Pasco.

2 >>: I'm Scott Royder. I live in the
3 mountains in Northeastern Washington. For over 200
4 years we've done so much damage to this planet that we
5 can no longer drink the water from our streams, breathe
6 the air from our sky and we cannot live peacefully with
7 the native people and the wildlife that walked the land
8 and swim the rivers and sea. What other indicators do
9 we need to know that we're poisoning our home?

10 It's time to join together to tear down the
11 barriers from our energy sources. Let us recognize
12 those things that separate us from our mother and one
13 another and begin now before its too late to reconnect,
14 unite and restore the ecosystem that supports and
15 invigorates us. Congratulations on coming this far.
16 Let's finish the job and free the river and take down
17 the dams.

18 THE MODERATOR: Next is Stacey Mitchell and
19 then Rick Nelson.

20 >>: My name is Stacey Mitchell. I work for
21 the U.S. (INAUDIBLE) I work for the Northwest Seattle
22 (INAUDIBLE). But I'm representing myself this
23 evening. I support the number four option of the Army
24 Corps of Engineers' presentation this evening, which is
25 breaching the lower dams.

1 Science groups have overwhelmingly supported
2 dam removal for years. Citizens have come out in
3 Spokane, Clarkston, Boise, and here in Seattle who have
4 overwhelmingly shown their support for dam removal.
5 Public comment continues to flow in for support of the
6 removal of the dams. Local tribes have overwhelmingly
7 stated why it is important for those dams to come
8 down. Fishermen have overwhelmingly stated that these
9 dams must come down. The decision seems obvious to me
10 and I think others in this room and I hope that it
11 doesn't come down to a political squabbling of what is
12 to come about with these dams. And I plead that you do
13 what's right and recommend removal of the lower Snake
14 River dams. Thank you.

15 THE MODERATOR: Next is Rick Nelson and Sam
16 Mace and Sierra Hansen. Rick Nelson? No. Okay.
17 Then Sam Mace.

18 >>: I like to throw people for a loop. I'm
19 Sam Mace, and I am Director of Washington Wildlife
20 Federation, Program Coordinator for Idaho Wildlife, and
21 Board President of Hell's Canyon Council. Tonight I'm
22 commenting on the Four-H paper and the EIS.

23 I want to make a couple of comments about --
24 I live in Spokane, Washington, and I think there's a
25 misconception, particularly over here in Western

1 Washington, that everyone in Eastern is opposed to
2 taking the dams out and not supportive of doing what it
3 takes to restore these runs. For those of you here who
4 also were part of the hearings over there, what was so
5 amazing was the incredible support for doing what it
6 takes to save the salmon and removing the dams. The
7 Spokane hearing showed the overwhelming support there
8 is out there for people for saving these runs.
9 Hundreds of people came to that hearing to talk about
10 how important these fish were for their families and
11 legacies. I really hope that after all this is done
12 and all the effort that people have made to come out
13 and all of the effort that you've put in, and I want to
14 say a huge thank you for doing this, but there's this
15 huge effort and expense and time has not been for
16 naut. You really do listen to what the people have
17 told you. And you act to save these fish and to take
18 these dams out. I know that I don't want to be, and
19 I'm sure you don't want to be, doing this five years
20 from now for doing more hearings. It was really hard
21 to get people out to the hearing in Spokane because
22 they thought they'd been doing it for years and there's
23 no hope. So I hope we act now, save the fish, and move
24 immediately to take these dams out.

25 THE MODERATOR: Next is Sierra Hansen. Have

1 we got Sierra here? No. Then Zorana Knapp.

2 >>: Hi. My name is Zorana Knapp and I was
3 born and raised in Spokane. I now live in Seattle.
4 I'm speaking on all three documents. I'm going to talk
5 about the T word, taxes or user fees. I think those of
6 us who support dam removal need to realize that we have
7 some of the cheapest gas in the world and we should pay
8 for that and help mitigate the people who will be
9 affected.

10 I know there will be a lot of impact. Some
11 of which we do know. Some of which the Army Corps of
12 Engineers have detailed. But none of us can foresee
13 anything. I believe we have the cheapest electricity
14 in the United States. We complain here when gas gets
15 to two dollars a gallon. That's our government that
16 has subsidized that. I think we could put some of our
17 taxes for that or for taxing electricity, user fees or
18 whatever we want to call them. As an environmentalist
19 I realize that talk is cheap and that I am willing to
20 support taxes or user fees to support the dam removal.
21 And I would encourage everybody out there who speaks
22 out to say that. I think that politicians, they say
23 they want to support the environment but then it's like
24 when you go to elect Congress and you ask people they
25 say they're all bad, they only go for -- it's all about

1 money. But when you ask about their own they say it's
2 wonderful and good. So people need to stand up and say
3 I support taxes. Not only do I want to see the
4 environment improve but I want to pay the price.

5 We've benefitted from the dams in various
6 ways in general. A lot of agricultural. And other
7 things that I'm not necessarily aware of so we enjoyed
8 those benefits. Electricity being one and
9 transportation. So now that we've enjoyed the benefits
10 it's time to pay the piper.

11 THE MODERATOR: Next is Diane Benson followed
12 by Julianne Seeman. Is Diane here? No. Julianne
13 Seeman? No. Okay. Aaron Tinker? No. Okay. Moving
14 right along here. Let me go to the next group. I'm
15 not sure -- Lauese Perry? Richard McFarland and
16 Meghan Pinter. Lauese Perry is 63. And then Richard
17 McFarland. And then Meghan Pinter. Any of those three
18 here? All right. Eric Ogden. And then Aaron Ostrom
19 and then Jota Borgmann. Eric? The next three will be
20 Rowland Garratt, Lisa Dekker and Joyce Mitchell. Are
21 you Rowland?

22 >>: Yes. I would like to make some general
23 comments. I'm Peter Garratt. Lived here for 40
24 years. Enjoyed the fruits of relatively inexpensive
25 electricity from an industrial standpoint and

1 personally, and the fruits of our agriculture. I have
2 a concern that we may be looking at the dam removal as
3 an easy way to get the salmon back. I don't think it's
4 that easy. I especially remember last summer I spent
5 about thirty minutes in the waters off the San Juans
6 watching a pod of orcas decimate a school of salmon and
7 I've seen the sea lions decimate the salmon. Sure,
8 dams have an impact on salmon return and survival. But
9 also does logging and farming, land development,
10 hatcheries and we must not forget our commercial and
11 sports fishermen, I would hope before we go through
12 with removing the dams we would have a plan in place to
13 attack all the factors that control salmon survival and
14 return. I would hate to see us just take the dams out
15 and find out fifteen years down the road we didn't
16 really solve the problem of the thank you.

17 THE MODERATOR: Next is Lisa Dekker. Joyce
18 Mitchell and Judith Hine.

19 >>: I'm Lisa Dekker. Member of the Sierra
20 Club here in Seattle. I'll be really brief. I just
21 wanted to say that after hearing all this evidence, and
22 there's a lot of it, I don't see how our region during
23 this prosperous period can look at this evidence and
24 come up with any other conclusion besides removal of
25 the dams. I don't know how we can ask other countries

1 and regions to make great sacrifices and tough
2 decisions when we can't or won't make this one. I want
3 to quote from an article in the Sierra Club magazine by
4 David James Duncan. "There are 75,000 dams in the lower
5 48 states. The removal of four dams would leave us
6 74,996 dams and it would leave us the salmon."

7 Thank you.

8 THE MODERATOR: Next is -- we're slipping
9 again here on the clapping. Maybe if you're getting
10 tired and you want to exercise, stand up and stretch
11 but I want to reinforce this. Let's try to -- there's
12 no cheering at least, but no more clapping. Joyce
13 Mitchell is next. Judith Hine and then Patrick Hewes.

14 >>: My name is Joyce Mitchell of the Sierra
15 Club and I'm here speaking as an average citizen. And
16 I am in favor of removal of the dams and for
17 alternative number four. I would like to address the
18 issue of the salmon as a critical part of an entire
19 ecosystem not only important to us as humans at the
20 high end of the food chain but all of the other
21 critters that are dependent on healthy food supplies
22 and in turn dependent on one another for their survival
23 and us dependent on them so the circle is complete.

24 When one part of the ecosystem is compromised
25 or destroyed it affects the health of the entire

1 system. I believe our long-term health is in jeopardy
2 now. We're all stewards of this planet earth. You are
3 official stewards. We need to take some
4 responsibility, change our behaviors, and do whatever
5 is necessary to save the salmon and be worthy stewards
6 of this extraordinary area we call home.

7 MODERATOR: Next is Judith Hine, Patrick
8 Hewes. Judith? No. Patrick Hewes? No. Heather
9 Burkett? No. And then following Heather Burkett,
10 Heather's not here. A. Felton Jenkins. Mat Lincecum,
11 and then Kell McAboy.

12 >>: My name is Felton Jenkins. I have an
13 over head and I asked somebody if I could just throw it
14 up if that's all right before I start talking?

15 PANEL: Do you have a paper copy of that by
16 any chance?

17 >>: Yeah.

18 PANEL: It's hard to see the screen from
19 here.

20 >>: I imagine it would be. My name is Felton
21 Jenkins. I'm a property owner in Seattle. I fish and
22 I boat. Each fall I make two or three trips over to
23 the Snake River, south of Clarkston, Washington. On
24 the way over there I buy gas, food, lodging, other
25 supplies in towns like Othello, Sultan, Clarkston, I

1 bought fishing licenses this year in Alaska and British
2 Columbia, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington state. That
3 right there is \$200 or \$300 and that doesn't include
4 all of the costs of travel, which is a another couple
5 of thousand dollars.

6 But that's the economic impact. What I've
7 tried to capture here on the spread sheet and it's hard
8 to talk to in a short period of time. I got these
9 benefits and costs primarily from the Columbia and
10 Snake rivers' campaign. Some are similar to what you
11 have in your study. Some are different. But adding
12 those up, you get to a total and you've got some
13 one-time charges and some recurring charges. To do the
14 proper net present value economic analysis you need to
15 lay those out year by year and discount that back to
16 the present. I did this for a private Fortune 500
17 company. I have done capital projects, et cetera, and
18 the results that I've come up with is that this set of
19 numbers gives you a nominal rate of return of 20
20 percent. A 20 percent investment on the breaching
21 investment. And then that's a net present value of ten
22 percent real discount rate of 500 million dollars. I
23 agree with the numbers some of the inputs that the
24 Corps came up with and I disagree with how they put
25 together their economic analysis. That's a good

1 investment, twenty percent. Your money doubles in
2 three-and-a-half years.

3 Any way, what else was I going to say? We
4 should thank Governor Kitzhaber in Oregon for speaking
5 favor of dam breaching. Our politicians here in
6 Washington state, particularly Gorton, Murray, and
7 Locke have all been beholden to a small number of
8 special interests instead of the majority of people in
9 this state. I think that's unfortunate. Any way,
10 those are my comments.

11 PANEL: The copy you gave me, the last column
12 didn't come out.

13 >>: Well, those numbers run out for 25
14 years. So basically the only anomaly is in this year
15 six I included a 425 million dollar one-time charge for
16 a turbine rewind that I understand is necessary
17 sometime soon. But the rest of the numbers would run
18 out.

19 MODERATOR: Okay. Matt Lincecum. And then
20 Kell McAboy and then Patricia Sumption.

21 >>: My name is Patricia Sumption. I've been
22 to two public meetings today. I was here this
23 afternoon. I had to leave to go to the Tacoma
24 Hydrotech Conservation Plan about Green River salmon
25 where people from National Fisheries and U.S. Fish and

1 Wildlife were interested.

2 We have problems folks. The answers aren't
3 necessarily the same for the Green River as for the
4 Columbia. Even if they were, we ain't getting that dam
5 out of there because it's a flood control dam. But
6 there isn't any reason to keep the dams on the lower
7 Snake like there is on the Green. But for now we can
8 get the four dams off the lower Snake. Who ever's
9 telling you that it doesn't pay, that there's a cost,
10 that somebody's going to have to pay, and it's much too
11 expensive, is not telling you the whole truth. If you
12 look at the real economic picture you'll see that it's
13 more expensive to kill off the salmon than to take
14 those dams down or partially down.

15 I sometimes think about, for example,
16 violence in school. We had somebody get killed today.
17 A seven or six year old killed another kid in the first
18 grade. Those are problems we ought to be able to
19 solve. This is another one. We could solve this if we
20 all said we're saving the salmon. We're not listening
21 to politicians. We care about salmon and ourselves.
22 Our own life style that we want out of life is to be in
23 a natural world. We don't need those dams.

24 Speaking of economics, who's getting the free
25 ride here? Well, you can say the salmon are getting

1 it. They can be put in a barge or something but that's
2 not the ride they want. People that go up and down
3 that river that don't have to pay to use the locks on
4 various dams. All kind of subsidies are going out. If
5 those people want dams that badly they should pay for
6 them. But we want them out and we'd be willing to pay
7 to get them out. Taxes or whatever, but get rid of the
8 dams. If we all work together on this, we could solve
9 the problems for the farmers, the labor people, whoever
10 is scared to death that their life will crumble around
11 them. We believe it's worth it to make some kind of
12 sacrifices to do that. We want all of the Four-H's to
13 be looked at. But on the Columbia Snake the answer is
14 one of the pieces, take out the dams. Breach the
15 dams. It needs to happen. And we need to stop being
16 political and be real. Put our hands together and say
17 we'll solve this problem.

18 THE MODERATOR: Patricia is the last sign up
19 person. Is there anyone else in the room who didn't
20 sign up but would like to testify here? Anyone
21 here? Why don't you come up and if there's anybody
22 else if you could come up and sit up in the front part
23 so you could be on deck after this speaker. Give us
24 your name slowly.

25 >>: Joelle Burgess. Joelle.

1 Thank you very much for listening to us. We
2 really appreciate it. I'm a 4th-generation
3 Washingtonian and I implore you to breach the dams.
4 The science has shown this is the best way to restore
5 the salmon population. Salmon deserve to live in their
6 own right. We have no authority to allow a species to
7 go extinct because all life is connected. The
8 devastation of salmon affects bears and other species,
9 including us humans. We often forget that we are part
10 of the natural system. Arguments have been made in
11 favor of the dams in the context that they help
12 humans. The greatest way that we can help humans is to
13 leave our ecosystems as intact as possible. Salmon
14 have survived so much and are so is strong. It's a
15 travesty to not do what we can to allow them to live.
16 Humans are intelligent. We can make up the losses.
17 There are power alternatives. The farmers can be paid
18 for what they'll lose, and we can come up with new
19 solutions to barging. As a citizen of the human race
20 and a taxpayer I'm willing to pay my share. All of
21 these arguments in the name of dollars and some jobs
22 pale in comparison to the pricelessness of the
23 species. Extinction is forever. All of the money in
24 the world can't bring back the species once it's gone.
25 To me it's crystal clear. We must act now. We owe it

1 to our children and our children's children. We do not
2 own the rivers or the land. The time is now. We need
3 salmon and the dams don't make sense.

4 MODERATOR: Anyone else who wished to say
5 something here? Anyone at all? Okay.

6 >>: Can you speak again? Could I have
7 another three minutes?

8 THE MODERATOR: No. I appreciate that. But
9 no.

10 So, on behalf of Donna Silverberg and me, we
11 appreciate your cooperation and your staying power and
12 energy and the quality of your work. We thank you very
13 much. And I wanted to ask the Colonel if he wanted to
14 have any closing comments?

15 >>: Again, thank you for staying with us
16 tonight. It's been a long day. I appreciate all the
17 comments and the civility in which the meetings this
18 afternoon and evening have been conducted. I wish you
19 all a good night. With that we'll declare this public
20 meeting closed.

21

22

23

24

25